

## REMARKS

### I. Examiner Interview

An Examiner Interview was held telephonically with Examiner Paula on January 18, 2005. A statement of the substance of the interview is submitted herein as follows. The Examiner Interview was attended by Pejman Sharifi, Jack MacCrisken, and Examiner Paula. Applicant submits that during the Examiner Interview, all pending claims were generally discussed, but claim 1 was discussed with greater particularity than the other pending claims. In the Examiner Interview, the prior art cited during the prosecution of the present application, specifically the Ludwig patent, was generally discussed in view of claim 1 to present distinguishing points over Ludwig. Applicant submits that during the Examiner Interview, Applicant, acting through their attorney, Pejman Sharifi, and expert, Jack MacCrisken, provided an explanation of the claimed invention as recited in claim 1 of the patent application prior to the present amendment. The Applicant submits that during the Examiner Interview certain features and advantages of the claims were explained. For example, the Applicant discussed the "time-sensitive," "dynamic," "object-based" aspects of the claims as recited in the application. For example, Applicant explained that the application is directed to presentation technology for sharing a rich media presentation with a group of participants. The technology can provide advantages such as the use of objects in forming rich media presentations, providing a time attribute for the objects so as to provide external time dependence of the object, and the ability to be dynamically assembled. In the Examiner Interview, agreement was not reached with respect to any particular amendment or rejection.

### II. Status of the Claims in the Application

With this amendment, claims 4, 10, 12-18, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30-36, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49-55, 60, and 62 are amended, claims 9, 11, 19-22, 24, 27, 29, 37-40, 42, 46, 48, 56-59, and 61 are cancelled without prejudice, and new claims 63-71 are added in order to present claims in better form for prosecution in the present application. As a result, claims 4, 10, 12-18, 23, 25-26, 28, 30-36, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49-55, 60, and 62-71 are pending in this application. The amendments are supported throughout the specification. As these amendments do not introduce new matter, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the

application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claims or the claims modified herein through deletion or revision of claim language in further prosecution of this application or in a continuing application.

## **II. Summary of the Office Action**

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 11-27, 29-46, and 48-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ludwig et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,689,641 ("Ludwig"). Claims 10, 28, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Bowman-Ammuah U.S. Patent No. 6,640,238 ("Bowman"). The Office Action also states that an information disclosure statement filed on February 27, 2002 failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1).

## **III. Ludwig Rejections**

In the Amendment filed September 20, 2004, Applicant respectfully traversed the conclusions of the Examiner. However, to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has cancelled independent claims 1, 6, and 44 without prejudice and presents new independent claims 63, 64, and 65 for prosecution. New independent claims 63, 64, and 65 are directed to one embodiment of the technology disclosed in the present application. Amendments to the dependent claims are clarifying amendment, which also address consistency of the language with the new independent claims.

The present invention, as defined in independent claims 63-65 improves on Ludwig through various advancements. As such, all the features of claims 63-65 are not described or shown by Ludwig. For example, claims 63 recites:

in response to a request to view the presentation,  
assembling a plurality of the dynamic rich media  
objects in real time on a server so that the dynamic rich  
media objects are synchronized on the basis of the start-  
time attribute in order to distribute to a requesting  
participant a version of the rich media presentation that  
dynamically varies as a function of the participant and  
object permission keys and of one or more participant-  
tracking attributes related to the requesting participant.

Ludwig describes a video conferencing technology dating as far back as 1993, which does not show or suggest the many improvement and features of claim 63. Ludwig does not show or suggest assembling dynamic rich media objects of a presentation in real time on a server in response to a request to view the presentation, wherein the objects are synchronized on the basis of a start time attribute of each object and the assembled version dynamically varies as a function of permission keys and tracking attributes of a requesting participant as recited in claim 63. Other aspects of claim 63 that are not shown or suggested by Ludwig, for example, include objects that are defined in accordance with an object model, object attribute fields that include tracking fields and participant input fields, and the storing of participant tracking and input attributes for a participant in the group when the participant has viewed a portion of the presentation. Moreover, the above-mentioned deficiencies in Ludwig are not alleviated by Bowman.

According, based at least on the foregoing, it is clear that the method of claim 63 is not anticipated or obvious in view of Ludwig, Bowman, or their combination. In addition, independent system and computer readable medium claims 64 and 65 are also allowable at least for the reasons provided with respect to independent claim 63. Since independent claims 63, 64, and 65 are allowable, dependent claims 4, 10, 12-18, 23, 25-26, 28, 30-36, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49-55, 60, and 66-71 are at least allowable due to their dependence from their respective base independent claim.

#### **IV. Information Disclosure Statement**

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1) in connection with a "Progress Report" listed in the original IDS filed on February 27, 2002. The Progress Report was listed in the IDS in the error. Applicant respectfully requests that all other references cited in the IDS be considered by the Examiner.

**V. Conclusion**

On the basis of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' Attorney if issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: April 25, 2005  
(Duplicate of Feb. 25, 2005 filing)

---

Pejman Sharifi (Reg. No. 45,097)  
for Allan A. Fanucci (Reg. No. 30,256)

**WINSTON & STRAWN LLP**  
**CUSTOMER NO. 28765**  
(212) 294-2603